

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY****\*\*\*DRAFT\*\*\*DO NOT ENTER\*\*\*DRAFT\*\*\*DO NOT ENTER\*\*\*****REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed March 2, 2006 has been received and reviewed. Claims 55-81 are in the case. Claims 57 and 69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 72-74 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 55-60 and 71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,651,037 to Hall et al. ("Hall"). Claims 61-65 and 72-74 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,895,454 to Harrington ("Harrington"). Claim 66 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,134,511 to Subbarao ("Subbarao"). Claim 67 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of Subbarao and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,885,694 to Pray et al. ("Pray"). Claims 68-70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of Subbarao and further in view of Pray and Harrington. Claims 75-76 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,179,213 to Gibino et al. ("Gibino"). Claims 77-78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of Gibino and further in view of Harrington. Claims 79-81 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of Gibino and further in view of Subbarao.

By this Amendment, claims 69, 72, 74, and 75 have been amended and claim 57 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claim 57 at a later date in a continuation or divisional application. Claim 82 has been newly added. Applicants assert that the amendments to claims 69, 72, 74, and 75, and newly added claim 82, are supported in the specification and add no new matter.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY****\*\*\*DRAFT\*\*\*DO NOT ENTER\*\*\*DRAFT\*\*\*DO NOT ENTER\*\*\*****Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph**

In the Office Action, the examiner rejects claim 57 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for "containing subject matter which was not described in the specification." The examiner rejects claim 69 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for "appear[ing] to be incorrect." Although Applicants believe that the subject matter of claim 57 is supported in the specification, Applicants cancel claim 57 without prejudice to expedite examination while reserving the right to pursue claim 57 at a later time. Applicants have amended claim 69 to clarify the subject matter recited therein and submit that claim 69 as amended is correct. Support for the amendment to claim 69 can be found in Applicant's specification on at least pg. 26, para. 1.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph**

In the Office Action, the examiner rejects claim 72-74 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for "insufficient antecedent basis." Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 72 by replacing the numeral "55" with the numeral "68" to provide proper antecedent basis. This amendment also provides proper antecedent basis for claim 73. With respect to claim 74, Applicants have inserted the term "module" to provide proper antecedent basis.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

In the Office Action, the examiner rejects claims 55-60 and 71 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hall. In particular, the examiner continues to assert that Hall discloses an input module and design module "configured to automatically provide multiple schematic representations reflecting distinct operational contexts of the selected design element," as recited in claim 55. (Office Action, pg. 5)

## BEST AVAILABLE COPY

\*\*\*DRAFT\*\*\*DO NOT ENTER\*\*\*DRAFT\*\*\*DO NOT ENTER\*\*\*

Applicants respectfully disagree with the examiner's position. Hall does not teach an input and design module "configured to automatically provide *multiple schematic representations* reflecting *distinct operational contexts* of [a] selected design element," as recited in claim 55. The Examiner is referred to Figure 5 of Applicants' patent application and the accompanying description in Applicants' specification for an explanation of the meaning of *multiple schematic representations* and *operational contexts* as recited in Applicants' claim. The examiner is referred to Figure 5 for a simple example of *operational contexts* as the phrase is used in Applicants' specification.

As illustrated, Figure 5 shows the selection of a heating coil element from a palette 164. The user may place a first schematic representation 184b of the heating coil in an air flow schematic and a second schematic representation 184 of the same heating coil in a separate hydronic schematic. For example, *multiple schematic representations* recited in claim 55 refer to the first and second schematic representations 184b, 184c and the *distinct operational contexts* refer to the air flow and hydronic schematics. (See pg. 20, para. 1-3).

Although Hall teaches "a two-dimensional representation of [an] HVAC air-handling assembly," (See Col. 7, lines 1-2) this representation does not reflect an *operational context*, as described in Applicants' specification, but is merely a way to illustrate the HVAC system. As described in Applicants' specification, these *operational contexts* may include, for example, an "air handler," "air flow," or "hydronic" schematic which may represent "the transport of mass, energy, or the like." (See pg. 20, para. 2-3). Furthermore, by "*automatically provid[ing]* *multiple schematic representations*," as required by claim 55, a user does not need to place "every possible schematic representation of a component in a project." (Page 21, paragraph 1). Thus, Applicants assert that Hall does not anticipate independent claim 55.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

\*\*\*DRAFT\*\*\*DO NOT ENTER\*\*\*DRAFT\*\*\*DO NOT ENTER\*\*\*

With respect to newly amended independent claim 75 and newly added claim 82, Applicants assert that claims 75 and 82 are allowable for the same reasons cited with respect to claim 55. Furthermore, claims 56, 58-74, and 76-81 are allowable at least due to their direct or indirect dependency from independent claims 55 and 75.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

\*\*\*DRAFT\*\*\*DO NOT ENTER\*\*\*DRAFT\*\*\*DO NOT ENTER\*\*\*

CONCLUSION

Applicants assert that claims 55, 56, and 58-82 are in condition for immediate allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks, is therefore respectfully requested. In the event that the examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of any of these claims, which could be clarified in a telephone conference, the examiner is respectfully urged to initiate the same with the undersigned.

DATED this \_\_\_\_ day of April, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

A. John Pate  
Reg. No. 36,234  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: April 10, 2006

PATE PIERCE & BAIRD  
550 Parkside Tower  
215 South State Street  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  
Telephone: (801) 530-0330  
Facsimile: (801) 530-5955  
Z:\ALL CLIENTS\3201 HVAC Solution\3201-2-1\3201-2-1 PAT-FIL-ROA3.wpd